

**Summary of Comments on Faculty Manual
December 1, 2014**

General Comments

#	Topic	Status	Page
Issue # 1:	Reservation of Rights: What is the intent of this section? Should it specifically state that it applies to the administrative section? Should the administrative section and the Organization of the Faculty be physically separated to avoid confusion about purview? How much notice will be given for applicability of the change? Can we incorporate a comment period?	Addressed	1
Issue #2:	Manual Revisions: Any minor revisions should come to the faculty no later than March of each year. The Manual should be reviewed every 5 years.	Procedural.	N/A
Issue #3:	Archival copies of the manual should be available on web site. Matrix of changes should be published as an appendix.	Will be completed.	N/A
Issue #4:	The History of the University is not the same in the Employee Handbook as the Faculty Manual	Addressed	2
Issue #5:	Index and Glossary need to be updated.	Will be completed.	N/A

Overarching issues

#	Topic	Status	Page
Issue #6:	In numerous places, the role of the Executive Dean is discussed. The role of the Academic Dean is not described, included, or discussed.	Addressed	34 and Throughout
Issue #7:	Full professors play a role in the evaluations of Candidates for full professor, but Academic Deans does not?	Addressed	33 and Throughout

Comments about Contract Types

#	Topic	Status	Page
Issue #8:	What is the difference between professional-practice and tenure contracts?	Addressed	23
Issue #9:	Why are professional practice faculty reviewed every 5, then 7 years, but tenured faculty are not reviewed again?	Outstanding	Outstanding
Issue #10:	Professional Development standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are they consistent across Colleges? Are the expectations equitable? Who is evaluating for fairness? 	In progress	-

**Summary of Comments on Faculty Manual
December 1, 2014**

Comments about Review Procedures

#	Topic	Status	Page
Issue #11:	CPC Chair evaluation of Peer Reviews, assessing that is not sufficiently evidence-based, and notifying the Senior Faculty member. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This does not happen consistently. If a CPC Chair is a renewable contract faculty, they may feel too vulnerable to actually fulfill this duty. Should the envelopes be opened by the entire committee? Should the communication come from the Committee and not the Chair? Should the Dean be evaluating and notifying the Senior Faculty? 	Addressed	42, 45, 55, 61, 72.
Issue #12:	Final decisions relative to Committee recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Committees would like information about unfavorable decisions. 	Addressed	35
Issue #13:	Probationary contract reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewers of probationary contracts seem to apply tenure/long-term contract standards. 	Under consideration	Under consideration
Issue #14:	Rubric for expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty would like a rubric for the review standards Evaluations of professional development: Are they based on quality or quantity? 	Under consideration	Under consideration
Issue #15:	In each review, it states that Program Directors' letters may be submitted, if applicable. Under what circumstances it is applicable?	Addressed	33
Issue #16:	Do Senior faculty members who serve as Program Directors need to also submit Senior Faculty Peer Review Evaluation?	Addressed	34
Issue #17:	Senior Faculty Peer Reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The process does not describe what happens in practice, e.g. in Kanbar College, for example, SBA faculty evaluate only SBA faculty. 	Addressed	32
Issue #18:	Faculty with administrative assignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where is the process for drafting the memorandum of understanding described? Why does it not describe that the Academic Dean will do this, in those Colleges where there are Schools with Academic Deans? Cross reference 19.2.4 with the section on faculty with administrative assignments. 	In progress	In progress
Issue #18:	Do we have mentoring programs for faculty up for renewal?	Under consideration	Under consideration
Issue #19:	The definition of classroom observation needs to be flexible enough to accommodate the different teaching formats and techniques within formats. On-campus vs. online; synchronous vs. asynchronous; individual vs. group.	Addressed	40, 43, 52, 58, 70
Issue #20:	The Executive Deans should be permitted to read the Senior Faculty Peer-Review Evaluations before writing their own Written Recommendation.	Addressed	Throughout
Issue #21:	Criterion C for tenure and promotion cases was revised to provide an introductory paragraph and better symmetry between the descriptions for the two contract types.	Addressed	53 and 54

**Summary of Comments on Faculty Manual
December 1, 2014**

Comments about Positions and Searches

#	Topic	Status	Page
Issue #22:	Contract types for New or Replacement Faculty Positions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The procedure for determining a contract type is not described. Must it be decided before it is approved and advertised? May it be decided after the search is conducted and the best candidate is selected? 	Addressed	23
Issue #23:	Must all searches be national searches? Yes, except by permission of the Provost.	Addressed	24
Issue #24:	For purposes of advanced standing, how is industry experience evaluated?	Addressed	24
Issue #25:	Searches for Candidates with Tenure Credentials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose and role of the CPC chair on searches for candidates with tenure credentials should be made more explicit. 	Addressed	29
Issue #26:	Modified Tenure Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are external peer reviewers in the tenure review required? Some schools do not use external peer reviewers in their tenure and promotion process. Do we require it? 	Addressed	25

Comments about procedures

#	Topic	Status	Page
Issue #27:	FMLA eligibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty read the Manual language to suggest that you may have only one “type” of FMLA eligibility within the total maximum of 2 year extension, i.e. one birth and one serious health concern 	Unchanged	N/A
Issue #28:	Conversion of contracts. Do we have a policy or procedure?	Addressed	Addressed
Issue #29:	Professional Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the expectations for outside or professional practice? Manual says 1 day/week. What are the procedures for arranging this with Academic or Executive Dean? 	Addressed	86-87
Issue #30:	We need a statement that describes what a renewable contract is. It should be included in dossiers for outside reviewers.	Under consideration	Under consideration
Issue #31:	Administrators with rank <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can an administrator with a rank apply for promotion in rank? If yes, what is the process and criteria? 	Outstanding	Outstanding
Issue #32:	Procedures and criteria for converting from visiting to a full-time line is not clear.	Addressed	25